

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, 111 N. York St., New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, July 16, 1879, under post office No. 154, New York, N. Y. Post office No. 154, New York, N. Y. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 16, 1918.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By Mail, Postage Paid outside of New York City. Single Copies: 5 Cents. Daily: 10 Cents. Sunday: 5 Cents. Foreign: 15 Cents. Yearly: \$1.00. Foreign: \$1.50. Single Copies: 5 Cents. Daily: 10 Cents. Sunday: 5 Cents. Foreign: 15 Cents. Yearly: \$1.00. Foreign: \$1.50.

FOREIGN RATES: DAILY AND SUNDAY. One month: \$1.00. Three months: \$2.50. Six months: \$4.50. One year: \$8.00. SUNDAY ONLY. One month: \$1.00. Three months: \$2.50. Six months: \$4.50. One year: \$8.00. FOREIGN RATES: DAILY AND SUNDAY. One month: \$1.00. Three months: \$2.50. Six months: \$4.50. One year: \$8.00. SUNDAY ONLY. One month: \$1.00. Three months: \$2.50. Six months: \$4.50. One year: \$8.00.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second-Class Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

"Cash!"

Did Mr. Wilson's "strict accountability" mean cash settlement? This must be the question every American will ask to-day, having read the published summary of the latest communication from the German Government. When, in the presence of our newly dead, Mr. Wilson informed the German Government that his nation would "omit no word or act" did he mean that it would not pause until it had received money for the murder of Americans? Was the principle that he set out to establish in the world the principle that it is expensive to murder Americans; that it costs money to send American women and children to their graves ruthlessly and barbarously?

Month after month we have waited while Mr. Wilson has exchanged words with that "friendly nation" which sent its submarines forth to murder in defiance of all law, human and divine. We have seen the total of our dead swollen by new slaughter, and we have seen Germany's allies take up the killing under their flags. Has it been for this accommodation that we have waited?

Are they now to quote rates in American lives on the German bourses as they do the price of cattle? Does Mr. Wilson believe that this American people will ever endure seeing written into the memory of their own or foreign peoples the precedent that the German offer in the Lusitania case would inscribe? Is there nothing in the world but money? Is the whole sum and substance of national honor and national safety guaranteed by the payment of a fixed sum, a cash bonus for the massacre of American citizens? Are the submarine commanders of the future to be warned:—

"Do not kill Americans unnecessarily—it costs money?"

This is all there is to the German proposal save for one thing. Even the money has a condition marked on the bills which are already blood stained. We are to get money for our dead under the actual or implied agreement that we shall attack the British. The price of the settlement is carefully nominated in the bond; Germany has the blood and the flesh, too, for her Shylock bargain; but this is not enough; in addition she must have American activity against her enemy; she must have the assurance that the nation whose children she has murdered will, in return for cash, for so much per head paid on the murdered, serve her interests against Great Britain.

How shall Americans hereafter face the world if there be once established the precedent that we sell our women and children for money and accept murder with no other protest than that incident to obtaining gold for their lives and for their injuries? More than this, how will they face the evidence that to get that gold we did not hesitate to sell our diplomacy to the murderer nation and make ourselves the agents of such a criminal country as that which invaded Belgium and burned Louvain?

We are not to go to war over the Lusitania, and that is understood. We are to accept the agreement as to the future, obtained by British sea power, not by our diplomacy, and that is inevitable. We are to go through the solemn farce of asserting a moral and diplomatic victory for a policy which for eight long months has done nothing but write words and utter empty boasts. That is humiliating, but tolerable. But is it tolerable, is it to be endured, that we should proclaim to the world that any one may murder American men, women and children, provided he is prepared to make a cash settlement thereafter?

We told Germany that we should hold her to "strict accountability." Did that mean to cash accountability? We told Germany that we should "omit no word or act to perform our sacred duty." Did that mean to get the money? We told Great Britain the other day that we eagerly accepted the task of championing the rights of neutrals and of humanity. Did that mean more for American honor, let him

at least reject the present German note offering money without disavowal and send a message to Congress asking that that body provide for the remuneration and indemnity of the heirs of those who were massacred upon the Lusitania. Let us pay for our own dead. Let us find the money that is needed without selling out our honor and shaming our dead by taking the gold of the men and the nation which murdered them and without pretending that this is the complete settlement of our case against Germany. Let us abandon notes, protests; let us accept the things that are to be accepted, since Mr. Wilson did nothing else; but let us not compound felony and condone murder by taking from the bloodstained hand of the assassin a piece of money which he offers as reparation for a brutal crime.

Our men, women and children of the Lusitania are dead. So far as our government is concerned they are forgotten. Their fate has become a matter of no concern to an administration eagerly looking for the advantages that it needs for its political campaign. "Forget the Lusitania" has become its watchword. But even this is more tolerable than that we should remember the Lusitania as a source of revenue and recall the tragedy to balance against our lives a handful of German gold.

It will be a shameful thing, enduring to dishonor and disgrace Americans beyond the life of any man now alive, if Mr. Wilson permits the Germans to establish the principle that it costs money, but nothing else, to murder Americans. "Peace at any price" would then mean peace at so much a head collected for those murdered.

This is what Mr. Wilson's "watchful waiting" diplomacy has come to in our German controversy. We saw a few days ago what it had come to in our Mexican policy. Shall we ask "Pancho" Villa to supply from his stealings and ransoms a price for those murdered in Mexico? Shall we take money from Germany, the same money perhaps that has been wrung from enslaved Belgium; shall we take this to satisfy all claims of honor and of civilization?

It is too much to expect that Mr. Wilson will ask more of Germany, but in the name of all that America has meant since its history began on Lexington Common Americans must ask him to reject the proposal to accept a cash settlement for a brutal murder which is not disavowed and will not be disavowed. He has trailed American honor in the mud; he has shamed and humiliated the American people beyond anything in their history, but he must spare us this. He must spare us the everlasting disgrace of a precedent proving that Americans put dollars above their dead and will take money for any injury whatsoever. Even Woodrow Wilson cannot surrender on such terms. He, who set out to protect American lives, cannot return with a handful of dollars—leaving our dead behind.

The Meaning of the Monroe Doctrine.

In a letter which we print in another column of this issue Mr. Allen W. Dulles, of Princeton, N. J., challenges The Tribune's statement of January 15 last that "the Monroe Doctrine binds us to assume responsibility to European countries for wrongs done in Mexico to their nationals, since we have told them that we should regard it as an unfriendly act if they attempted to exact redress by military intervention." Mr. Dulles says that the Monroe Doctrine does not bind us to assume any such responsibility. Yet the cases which he cites do not bear out his contention, the later ones clearly showing a much broader interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine than that which he deduces from the earlier ones.

The point to keep in mind is that the Monroe Doctrine and the policies which result from it are a natural growth. To say that the Doctrine means now exactly what it meant in 1823 or in 1851 is to overlook the fact that it is a living declaration, not a mummified one. The Doctrine was unquestionably expanded in 1895 by Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Olney. It has been still further expanded by President Roosevelt and by President Wilson. Moreover, the acquisition of the Panama Canal Zone and the building of the Panama Canal have necessarily altered its application in relation to the region of the Caribbean and to the states which lie between our southern boundary and Panama.

The United States does not now fear direct political intervention on the part of foreign nations in this area. We have passed the stage at which European powers would be tempted into another wild venture such as placed Maximilian on the throne in Mexico. What is to be feared is political intervention masked under the form of reparation for injuries to European nationals and resulting in the concession of rights, privileges and holdings of a semi-public character. The United States Senate passed in 1912 a resolution giving warning against the occupation or possession of harbors on the American continent by foreign governments through the medium of private corporations and associations. It is this sort of indirect attack which the Monroe Doctrine is nowadays being enlarged to meet.

The last notable attempt by European powers to extort reparation from an offending Latin-American country was the blockade of Venezuela's ports by Great Britain, Germany and Italy in 1902. This was war under the disguise of a "pacifi-

blockade." It was political intervention under a milder name. Opinion in the United States was greatly exercised by this experiment. Although the government formally accepted the assurance of the blockading powers that they were only trying to collect just debts and had no political ends in view, all the influence of the administration was exerted to end the blockade and bring about a resort to arbitration.

The full history of the Venezuela blockade has never been told. Only a couple of weeks ago Mr. Poindexter, of Washington, read in the Senate a statement dealing with the inside history of the Venezuela incident, according to which President Roosevelt had to threaten to send the Atlantic fleet to Venezuelan waters to raise the blockade before the German government could be induced to consent to arbitration.

The United States went into the Dominican Republic to administer the Dominican debt for the primary purpose of forestalling action by European powers to extort settlements through naval demonstrations. Even more pointed was President Wilson's military occupation of Hayti last summer, which had as its main purpose to prevent a foreign occupation of Mole St. Nicholas and other Haytian ports through concessions which might be granted to European creditors. Our present protectorate in Nicaragua rests on much the same basis.

The United States has shown repeatedly in recent years its determination to limit very strictly the right of foreign nations to seek redress in the territory tributary to the Panama Canal. Mexico lies in that area. The Senate resolution of 1912 was aimed particularly at reported Japanese schemes for getting a foothold on Mexico's Pacific coast. It is idle, therefore, to say that we allow foreign nations entire freedom in seeking natural redress for wrongs done their nationals in Mexican territory. We do not. And if we do not, we must assume the moral obligation to protect those nationals so far as they can be protected by our insistence on the maintenance of order and stability in Mexico. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot abridge the right of foreigners to seek reparation and then dodge our moral responsibility to them and refuse to do what we are able to do of our own might to protect their lives and property.

New York's Men for New York.

If Mayor Mitchell can align this city's legislative delegation in support of a definite financial programme for the municipality's benefit he will have accomplished much. The conference to which he has invited them to discuss the matter with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, the Merchants' Association and other civic bodies ought to convince them that there is no substantial difference of opinion here on the treatment of the city's services. Least of all is there room for partisan differences, for the taxpayers here suffer—and pay—regardless of party affiliation. Yet that is the rock on which the scheme is likely to split.

The New York delegation, standing together solidly, regardless of party affiliations, would be a body too strong to ignore. It could have, within reason, practically anything it wanted from the Legislature. And what this poor, harassed city administration asks from the lawmakers is reasonable enough, in all conscience—it is the merest justice. It wants fairness in the distribution of tax funds to which New York contributes; it wants power to fix salaries of officials who have to be paid out of the budget. No legislator elected from this city is fit to be a representative of his district if he is not willing to fight for these things and rate them in importance before all other issues of the session. It is only by such a fight that New York will win fair treatment. There is in the Mayor's proposal a perfectly fair issue for legislators to meet.

Why couldn't Mr. George von L. Meyer and Mr. Truxton Beale have exchanged notes instead?

Logwood for Dyes.

We are not absolutely dependent upon British goods for logwood. We can get it from Central America, and while British Honduras is the most natural, it is not the only, place to look for it. The Department of Commerce learns that there has been a good deal of logwood in British Honduras waiting for a customer, and the cutting of the wood has stopped because there was a poor market for it. If Great Britain does not wish to spare any of its Honduras logwood to us, there is a good deal of logwood in other parts of Central America, and in Cuba, where it used to be cut till the price sank to a non-remunerative point. With the present demand for dyes of almost any sort the prices ought to stimulate production. The fast yellow can also be obtained in Central America and Cuba, but this color we make here from domestic sources, and export a considerable amount of the dye.

"A Golden Nation."

Blame not the cloddish peon that he thought No harm could come of slaying us. 'Tis we Ourselves have made our name a mockery; We have cast down the faith our fathers taught. Life, love and hope, we said, these can be bought; So much will pay for you, so much for me— A golden nation by a golden sea, That lived for gold, in gold its fetters wrought.

Submission, vile and open as the day! No guiding principle, no granite stand, These are the things have made our race a prey To whose wills, by water or by land— The State of Washington moulds to decay, And dead men call along a lonely strand. EARL SIMONSON.

A NEW AMERICANISM

The Lesson for This Country in the World War.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: General Wood has asked, has even begged, for a larger and better equipped army.

For a President who must preserve peace under all circumstances one could not possibly think of a more capable, patient and persevering man than President Wilson, but as a pilot during an international crisis he is an absolute failure. I do not think that Count von Bernstorff will ever be the Secretary of State, even theoretically; but it seems as though this useless and wanton slaughter of American citizens on the high seas by German and Austrian U-boats will continue until March 4, 1917. The only thing that the Teuton murderers will recognize is power, or a threat of power with some actual force behind it.

The only way we can remedy these defects is by preparedness. The sooner we learn that "millions for defence" is cheaper than "one cent for tribute" the better. The awakening to this fact when it is too late will do us no good; deliberation is costly. It is recognized and understood that had we been prepared in August, 1914, no Lusitania, Arabic, Hesperian, Persia, Ancona would have been sunk with their cargo of precious lives.

As badly as we need an adequate army, it is just as imperative that we have a navy quite capable of defending our shores; in fact, Admiral Dewey says that it should be "second to none." Wilson in ten years might build ten dreadnoughts, submarines, scout and battle cruisers, etc.; in fact, our President is just about beginning to think of this. But we need a President who can give us these ten dreadnoughts in two or three years, a man who can provide an army of 300,000 or more, if necessary, without "making America an armed camp," and saying that, anyway, we are "too proud to fight."

Many people are of the opinion that Theodore Roosevelt, as President in such a time as this, might prove a disastrous experiment; that he is too quick to jump at conclusions, and thus war might be inevitable. But I am inclined to believe that there would be one crisis, and only one—we wouldn't have to worry about how many of these so-called "diplomatic victories" our State Department might win. It is true, oddly enough, that many of us have laughed at Colonel Roosevelt and what he has said, and yet several months or a year later we accepted these same views as the only sound ones. His views on preparedness and international relations are sensible as well as practical. The coming election should be in a large sense a national one, not a party one. We have no special apprehension concerning "unwritten laws" as to whether a man should accept a third term as President. If a man can serve his country well every time we should hold no anxiety as to whether he is our Chief Magistrate a hundred times. Our next President, whether he be Roosevelt, Hughes or another, should be a real strong man, who is in accordance with the ideas expounded by the Colonel, a man who can do deliberately and well what has taken Wilson four years to think of.

If this world war can accomplish nothing more, so far as we are concerned, it ought to teach us a lesson, and from that lesson let there arise a "New Americanism" of the right sort.

I have disagreed with the policy of The Tribune many times, as is only natural, but now I cannot do so. I agree, and I sincerely thank The Tribune for all of its intelligent editorials.

J. EDWARD LUMBARD, JR.
New York, Jan. 23, 1916.

Connecticut's Deer Slaughter.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I have before me a clipping from the weekly edition of "The Danbury (Conn.) News," under date of January 5, 1916. The heading tells the story: "One Thousand Deer Killed. Wholesale Slaughter of Animals in State Since August." These figures are apparently given out by the superintendent of the State Fish and Game Commission, and may therefore be called official.

As I write I have not the latest data at hand. A summary of the game laws of the several states for 1915, corrected to October 20, 1914, fails to reveal any legislation similar to Connecticut's in any other state. In most of the states other than Connecticut an absolute "close season" prevails. In a few "open season" is allowed. "Local exceptions," of course, exist in certain states.

The Connecticut act does not stipulate that deer may be taken or killed only when damage has been done by them to growing crops, etc. It does not limit the number that may be killed or taken. It does not restrict the privilege to residents of the state; for the words, "any member of his family," may be construed to include non-residents. It specifies that for killing a stag is to be used. No sportsman thinks of hunting such game as deer with a shotgun. The use of shotguns increases the number of animals who are wounded and escape, perhaps to die a lingering death—an event which is deplored by every true sportsman. It specifies all bucks and both fawns and does as lawful subjects for slaughter at any time. This is quite counter to the better sentiment now generally existing.

In New Brunswick any one who "hunts, takes, hurts, injures, traps, snares, shoots, kills or destroys" a cow, or calf, or horse, or pig, is liable to \$200 fine or three months in jail. The law defines a male animal as a calf until he is at least three years old and has at least three times not less than four inches long on each antler. Moose and caribou have more commercial value as "trophy" than deer, and deer are comparatively more plentiful. But the same general principle should be applied to the killing of deer.

The Connecticut act allows "capture" by any means except a "trap, snare or device." Whether this includes the lasso or the bolas is a matter for debate. But it does apparently mean to run down by dogs—one of the meanest of obsolete hunting practices. "Jacking," another indefensible method, may also apparently be employed when feasible. Lastly the report of the killing or "capture" is not to be made to a game warden, constable or other local official, but to one of the Fish and Game Commissioners or to the commission as a whole. This would probably never be done within twenty-four hours, as the law provides; and frequently, we may suppose, would not be done at all. For failure to report penalties are imposed, but to be sure the possibilities of evasion are obvious.

I have above presented an object lesson in cause and effect. Until the passage of this act deer were to be given to Connecticut prior to June 1, 1917. The act was named, and "wholesale slaughter" followed. Have Dr. Hornaday and others labored in vain to instruct our legislators?

G. S. BRYAN.
Brookfield Centre, Conn., Jan. 11, 1916.

What Is Going On.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Permit me to extend my appreciation of the running of the "What Is Going On Today" column Sunday. As a filler of evenings that would otherwise be spent at home, it can't be beat. In fact, to be frank, it was the column that made me a reader of The Tribune, finding it in a train one morning on my way to business. Today, it is the first thing I look at.

JOHN L. WILSON.
New York, Jan. 17, 1916.



OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN THE AMERICAS

What the Monroe Doctrine and the Precedents Established Under It Bind Us to Do in Respect of Protecting Citizens of European Countries—A Dissenter.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The Tribune in referring editorially to the Monroe Doctrine, in its issue of January 15, used the following words: "The Monroe Doctrine binds us to assume responsibility to European countries for wrongs done in Mexico to their nationals, since we have told them that we should regard it as an unfriendly act if they attempted to exact redress by military intervention."

There is embodied in this statement a popular conception of the Monroe Doctrine which is at variance with the official position of the United States government in matters affected by this policy. In the famous statement of President Monroe there is nothing which hints at an obligation to protect the interests of the subjects of European powers in other American states. He laid down the principle that (1) "the American continents are henceforth not to be considered as subject for future colonization by any European power"; (2) "that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

The United States stands as the guarantor of the political and territorial integrity of the Americas. Neither under Monroe nor at the present time has it stood between an American and a European power when the latter has had a grievance against the former, unless the only way in which that grievance could be satisfied involved the permanent seizure of American territory or a change in the form of an American government. Even President Roosevelt, who gave the Monroe Doctrine the broadest possible interpretation, declared that "an aggrieved nation can without interfering with the Monroe Doctrine, take what action it sees fit in the adjustment of its disputes with American states, provided that action does not take the shape of interference with the form of government or of the despoilment of their territory under any guise," and, again, "we do not guarantee any state against punishment if it misconducts itself, provided that punishment does not take the form of the acquisition of territory by any non-American power."

The instances in which European powers have enforced their claims against American states directly and by measures of force are numerous. Great Britain blockaded Nicaragua in 1842 and again in 1844, and Salvador in 1851. Some years later that same power went so far as to seize Brazilian vessels as an act of reprisal. Spain made war on the states of the west coast of South America in 1805, and bombarded Valparaiso. At that time Secretary Seward made the statement that the United States would not intervene in wars between European and American states unless they are "pushed to the political point."

In more recent times (1901) Great Britain, Germany and Italy blockaded the coast of Venezuela to force the payment of claims which that state refused to satisfy. At that time the German Ambassador took pains to inform Secretary Hay "that under no circumstances do we (Germany) consider in our proceedings the acquisition or the permanent occupation of Venezuelan territory." This declaration was satisfactory to the United States and no objection was made to the use of force against Venezuela.

The United States has not assumed responsibility for the failure of the Latin-American states to meet their obligations to European powers, except in the cases where adequate redress could only be secured by the powers through measures which would lead to a permanent occupation of territory. When in the opinion of foreign states such measures are necessary to get satisfaction, then the United States considered itself to be under obligation to see that the just demands of these powers are met, since it has objected to the use of these measures by the foreign states. In order to prevent foreign intervention in Santo Domingo which might result in permanent occupation, the United States in 1905 agreed to administer the customs in such a way as to satisfy the claims of the European creditors. The action which was

GENERAL UPTON'S WORK

There Exists No Better Authority on Our Military Needs.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: At a time when it would seem as though every Congressman had a bill for the improvement of the army it is strange that no reference is made in Congress to the sound teachings of General Upton on this subject. In vain have I watched your editorial columns for a tribute to this man, in whom the greatest honor is due. No well-informed critic impugns the efficiency of our present army as far as concerns its personnel. Its only demerit is lack of numbers to meet the demands of the present situation.

And yet the present army of the United States, in its General Staff, in its three battalions formation, in its promotion conditions upon stiff examinations, and largely in its tactics, is a creature of this enlightened officer. General James Wilson said of him: "No one can read the story of his career without concluding that he had a real genius for war. He was the equal of Hoche, Desaix or St. Cyr in all military accomplishments and virtues." At the laying of the cornerstone of the army War College, Ellihu Root, who was at that time Secretary of War, stated that many of the mistaken practices which General Upton points out in his book, "The Military Policy of the United States," have already been abandoned. Yet the bills which have been introduced in Congress show the same ignorance, the same faults against which Upton warns us, with a reiteration that becomes almost tiresome, but which is necessary. His book proves over and over again, by illustrations drawn from our military history, the extravagance and peril underlying the present administration's "tentative army." And it would be more easy to trust a rope of sand than to commit the safety of our beloved country to forty-eight "armies," as they were denominated in Congress; in other words, to a force made up of companies of the national guard, each recognizing only the authority of its state.

As a loyal American, I wish that our Congressmen might be required to read in the "Military Policy" the shameful story of the operations of the militia in New York and in defense of Washington during the War of 1812. This would fit them to vote intelligently. Upton's work has been published by the government and is easily accessible. Thanking you for the staunch Americanism of your editorials, I am faithfully yours, A MEMBER OF THE ORDER OF THE CINCINNATI.
New York, Jan. 19, 1916.

Regulate Gasoline Prices.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Is the indiscriminate price-raising of gasoline to continue without any protection for the people from our officials? Are our laws so lax that once a monopoly is gained, and the product is a necessity, the price of such an article may have no limit when controlled by callous and unscrupulous men? Gasoline since the advent of the automobile has become a necessity and more valuable to the people as a means of distance elimination than the streetcar and the other minor conveyances. And yet when the state grants the rights and issues franchises to the operating companies it unconditionally regulates the maximum fare to be charged. Surely the state possesses some right to stop the outrageous increase in the price of gasoline.

Some time ago an attempt was made to increase the price of bread one cent a loaf until the Governor of the state after a vigorous and drastic inquiry threatened the responsible for such action with jail sentence, with the immediate result that the price of bread was lowered to its normal standard. Gasoline to-day is just as much a necessity to the material progress of man as bread is to his physical health, and yet no attempt is being done to check the mad rise in price. JOSEPH LEWIS.
New York, Jan. 19, 1916.

W. B. HOTCHKIN.
New York, Jan. 17, 1916.